

Application No. 10/657472
Page 8

Amendment
Attorney Docket No. S63.2H-11273-US01

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated November 28, 2005.

In the Office Action previously allowable claims 2, 3, 6-11, 13, and 14 were rejected. Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al (US Patent 6,099,497) in view of Igaki (US Patent 5,817,100). Claims 6-7 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al (US Patent 6,099,497) in view of Igaki (US Patent 5,817,100) and further in view of Dayton (US patent 5,449,382). Claims 8-10 have allowable subject matter but were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base. Applicant addresses the objections and rejections under heading consistent with those of the Office Action.

35 USC § 112

Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The Office Action asserts there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the medical balloon" in line 7 of claim 13. Applicant has amended claim 13 to correct the antecedent basis issue.

35 USC § 103

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al (US Patent 6,099,497) in view of Igaki (US Patent 5,817,100). Applicant disagrees with this rejection. The Office Action suggests that Adams teaches all the limitations of claim 2 except for the rotatable sheath which is asserted to be taught in Igaki. However, in claiming the secondary guidewire housing, claim 2 recites "at least a first distal portion of the guide wire housing being engaged to at least a first proximal portion of the rotatable sheath". As illustrated

Application No. 10/657472

Page 9

Amendment
Attorney Docket No. S63.2H-11273-US01

in Figs. 14D, 17, and 18, the distal end of the sheath taught in Adams ends at a point proximal to the distal end of the "guidewire housing". Thus, Adams does not teach a *distal* portion of the "guidewire housing" engaged to a *proximal* portion of the rotatable sheath. This limitation is not supplied by Igaki which fails to teach a secondary guidewire housing.

The Office Action states that Adams does not disclose a rotatable sheath and looks to Igaki to supply this missing teaching. In as much as Igaki teaches a rotatable sheath, Igaki does not teach a "stent disposed about at least a portion of the rotatable sheath" as recited in claim 2. As shown in Figs. 6-8 and taught in Igaki, the sleeves/sheaths are disposed about the stent rather than the stent disposed about the sheath. Thus, the recited limitation of claim 2 is neither taught nor suggested by the references individually nor their combination.

Finally, claim 2 also recites "a distal end portion of the secondary guide wire housing exiting the flow path of the stent through one of the plurality of cell openings". This is not taught or suggested in either Adams or Igaki. Adams in Fig. 14D shows the guidewire leaving the secondary guidewire proximal to stent 156. Igaki does not teach a secondary guidewire housing at all.

For at least the above reasons, claim 2 and claim 3 dependent thereof are not obvious in light of Adams and Igaki. Applicant respectfully requests that the 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6-7 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al (US Patent 6,099,497) in view of Igaki (US Patent 5,817,100) and further in view of Dayton (US patent 5,449,382). As shown above, Adams and Igaki fails to teach the limitations of claim 2. Dayton does nothing to provide these missing teachings as Dayton does not teach rotation of a sheath or a second guidewire housing. Independent claim 2 is believed to be in

Application No. 10/657472
Page 10

Amendment
Attorney Docket No. S63.2H-11273-US01

condition for allowance. As claims 6-7 and 11 claim dependence on independent claim 2, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8-10 have allowable subject matter but were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base. It is believed that these claims are in condition for allowance as they claimed dependence on a claim in condition for allowance. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claim 9 to include the limitations of the base claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn and that claims 8-10 be allowed.

Application No. 10/657472
Page 11

Amendment
Attorney Docket No. S63.2H-11273-US01

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing it is believed that the present application, with pending claims 2, 3, 6-11, 13, and 14, is in condition for allowance. Early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: January 27, 2006

By: Brendan Babcock

Brendan C. Babcock
Registration No.: 50705

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001
f:\wpwork\bcb\11273us01_amd_20060111.doc